United Nations A/C.3/60/SR.42

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
2 December 2005

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 42nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 17 November 2005, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Butagira ..... (Uganda)

Contents

Agenda item 69: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*)

Agenda item 70: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 39: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-60898 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 69: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.63)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.63: Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

1. **Ms. Bowen** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, introduced the draft resolution, which encouraged the implementation of the globally agreed agenda for the elimination of racism and related intolerance within the framework of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The text of the resolution was largely based on General Assembly resolution 59/177 but had been updated to reflect recent developments in the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Kazakhstan had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

(a) Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/C.3.60/L.60)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.60: Inadmissibility of certain practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

2. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

3. **Mr. Lukyantsev** (Russian Federation), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the adoption of the draft resolution would not only make a real contribution towards the elimination of racism and related intolerance but would also send a clear warning to those promoting ideas of racial purity or discriminating on the basis of race and ethnicity.

4. **The Chairman** said that the following countries wished to sponsor the draft resolution: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Nigeria, South Africa, the Sudan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

5. **Ms. Shestack** (United States of America) called for a vote on the draft resolution. She said that, while she shared the sponsors' repugnance regarding racism and xenophobia, freedom of expression needed to be protected. The draft resolution failed to distinguish between statements made in exercise of freedom of expression and statements that incited to acts of violence.

6. **Mr. Dixon** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Croatia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine said neo-Nazism was a particularly abhorrent manifestation of racism and xenophobia and needed to be tackled at all levels. The European Union had accordingly worked with the main sponsors at the recent meeting of the Commission on Human Rights to reach a consensus. That consensus no longer held, as the draft resolution went far beyond the agreed text. It subjected the enjoyment of human rights to unacceptable conditions and thus undermined the right to associate, assemble or express one's opinion. Paragraph 4, in particular, was unacceptable. Limitations determined by law must never be aimed at the destruction of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In its current form, the draft resolution was not a meaningful tool to fight neo-Nazism and other forms of racism. He would therefore abstain from the vote. His explanation of vote had been approved by the European Union as a whole and by Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine.

7. **Mr. Hannesson** (Iceland) aligned himself with the views expressed by the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union.

8. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras,

India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.60 was adopted by 97 votes to 4, with 63 abstentions.**

10. **Mr. Ballestero** (Costa Rica) said that the draft resolution departed significantly from the text approved by the Commission on Human Rights and expressed regret that it had not given rise to more consultations. It was not clear why the draft no longer stated that the SS organization and all its constituent parts, including the Waffen SS, were criminal; the third preambular paragraph mentioned only part of the SS and not the entire organization. Likewise, paragraph 2 singled out the Waffen SS, which had not been specified in the earlier text.

11. He was concerned that paragraph 4 was couched in general and a priori terms; it categorically described all the acts referred to in earlier paragraphs as being in violation of such rights as freedom of peaceful assembly and association and represented an undue limitation on action by the competent national authorities, including those responsible for guaranteeing the full enjoyment of human rights. The same was true of paragraph 5, which had been turned into a categorical statement.

12. His delegation, while supporting the Russian Federation's initiative in submitting the draft resolution, deeply regretted that it had not been adopted by consensus, as he hoped other such texts against neo-Nazism would be in future, following the necessary negotiations.

Agenda item 70: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A.C.3/60/L.62)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.62: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

13. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications and that Andorra, Armenia, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Comoros, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, the Niger, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Saint Lucia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

14. **Mr. Elbadri** (Egypt) said that the draft resolution was an annual one submitted by his delegation in order to affirm the international community's solidarity with the Palestinian people. He hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

15. **Mr. Meron** (Israel) quoted a statement by the Prime Minister of Israel to the effect that the Jewish people's right to live in Israel did not disregard the Palestinians' right to self-determination, which Israel

* The delegations of Bangladesh, Ghana and Nicaragua subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

supported. The draft resolution failed to take into account the ongoing bilateral negotiations or the mechanism already in place known as the "road map". Because it added nothing to the situation, he could not support it.

16. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote had been requested by the representative of Israel.

17. **Ms. Shestack** (United States of America) said that she too had intended to call for a recorded vote.

18. **Ms. Mortenson** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine expressed firm support for the Palestinian people's unconditional right to self-determination. The two-State solution set out in the Quartet's road map and agreed on by both parties would offer the best possible guarantee for the security of Israel and the acceptance of Israel as an integrated partner in the region. The recent Israeli withdrawal from Gaza and parts of the West Bank and the agreement on movement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority were significant steps forward.

19. She welcomed the forthcoming elections to the Palestinian Legislative Council and emphasized that violence and terror were incompatible with democratic processes. She urged all factions, including Hamas, to renounce violence, recognize Israel's right to exist, and disarm. She urged Israel to facilitate the preparation and conduct of the elections and to cease all activities, including settlement building and the construction of the separation barrier, that would jeopardize the two-State solution.

20. **Mr. Morro** (Spain) requested that Spain should be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

21. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Equatorial Guinea, Tuvalu.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.62 was adopted by 162 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.*

Explanations of vote

23. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) expressed unqualified support for the draft resolution. There could be no lasting peace or security

in the region until the Palestinian people could exercise its right to self-determination.

24. **Ms. Chatsis** (Canada) said she regretted that the reference in the draft resolution to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice had not emphasized its non-binding character or been counterbalanced by a mention of Israel's security concerns.

25. **Mr. Ainchil** (Argentina) said that his country recognized the Palestinian people's right to self-determination but stressed that the exercise of that right required the existence of an active subject in the form of a people under domination. He referred in that connection to resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV) of the General Assembly.

26. **Ms. Rasheed** (Palestine) said that the denial of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination was at the heart of the problems besetting the Middle East and that the international community's reaffirmation of that right was essential. Israel's negative vote on the draft resolution demonstrated its rejection of a peace settlement based on mutual recognition between the two sides. Such recognition was, however, a prerequisite for all peace-settlement negotiations.

27. Israel's policy of settlement construction and wall building was jeopardizing the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and undermining the peace process. She wondered how the United States of America could cast a negative vote on a draft resolution reaffirming that right, while being in favour of the establishment of an independent State of Palestine living side by side with Israel in peace and security. She urged it to reconsider its vote, which was inconsistent with its stated position in regard to the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation.

28. She hoped that such a draft resolution would not have to be submitted the following year, but if it did, that it would be carried unanimously.

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.26)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.26: International Covenants on Human Rights

29. **Mr. Kh** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, since the funds needed to cover activities under the draft resolution had already been appropriated by the General Assembly, its adoption would not entail any further appropriation. He called attention to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B.

30. **Mr. Makarowski** (Sweden) said that, following consultations, certain revisions had been made which he trusted would enable the Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. In paragraph 2, the following words should be deleted: "*Takes note with appreciation* of the new States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as well as the Optional Protocols to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and". In the same paragraph, the words "and, while acknowledging that additional States have recently become parties to these instruments," should be inserted before "requests". The word "*Welcomes*" at the beginning of paragraph 23 should be replaced by "*Takes note with appreciation of*". At the end of paragraph 26, the words "and welcomes in this regard the decision at the 2005 World Summit to double the regular budget resources of the Office over the next five years" should be deleted.

31. Australia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay had joined the list of sponsors.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.26 was adopted.*

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.42/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.42/Rev.1: Incompatibility between corruption and the full enjoyment of human rights

33. **Ms. Zach** (United States of America) said that, due to the diverse views of many countries, the sponsors wished to pursue consultations with

concerned delegations, with a view to discussing the topic in the Committee in the future. She therefore wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.42 and Rev.1.

34. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that, although the draft resolution had been withdrawn, his delegation wished to highlight the importance of any initiative on combating corruption. It favoured a broad integral approach to the problem; a selective narrow approach was a contravention of the recently adopted United Nations Convention against Corruption. The international repercussions of corruption should be taken seriously, particularly with respect to the blatantly corrupt practices implemented by multinational corporations in large powerful countries.

(c) Human rights questions: human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.48)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.48: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

35. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

36. **Mr. Jones Parry** (United Kingdom), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the original sponsors and Bulgaria, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Palau, the Republic of Moldova and Serbia and Montenegro, said that he welcomed the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A/60/306). The continuing reports of systematic, widespread and grave violations of human rights in that country and the refusal of the Government to recognize the mandate of the Special Rapporteur or to extend cooperation to him required that the General Assembly should now take up the question of the situation of human rights in that country.

37. **Mr. Kim** Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation was deeply concerned that the United States and the European Union were misusing human rights issues to further their political agenda against small or weak developing countries and that it categorically rejected draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.48. He said that the draft resolution contained fabrications and distortions concocted by the United States, Japan and certain European Union countries and their non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur was said to have met in South Korea with organizations which lured and brainwashed North Korean defectors. It was surprised that the Special Rapporteur had met with such criminal organizations to discuss human rights and remained convinced that it had been right not to deal with him. Such human trafficking clearly constituted a flagrant violation of international law and human rights.

38. The draft resolution was aimed at interfering in the internal affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. He wished to point out that it was up to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic to decide whether or not to continue receiving humanitarian assistance and questioned the motives of the United States, the European Union and Japan in pressing the country to continue doing so.

39. The United States was using counter-terrorism as an excuse to kill civilians, use illegal weapons and torture prisoners in secret prisons across the world, while the European Union remained silent. The European Union's rejection of the draft resolution on the human rights of detainees in Guantánamo Bay clearly demonstrated its double standards in the field of human rights advocacy. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarded all draft resolutions submitted by the United States and the European Union against the developing countries as a culmination of politicization, double standards and selectivity in the field of human rights.

40. **Mr. Degia** (Barbados) said that his delegation was alarmed at the increasingly political and divisive nature of the human rights debate in the Committee. The specific targeting of certain countries was not productive, especially as all countries were striving to achieve a clean human rights record and good governance. It was particularly unhelpful that certain Member States had seen fit to submit draft resolutions targeting specific countries at a time when the United Nations was discussing the reform of its human rights machinery and the establishment of the Human Rights Council. With that in mind, his delegation would continue to abstain from voting on country-specific draft resolutions or to support no-action motions.

Explanations of vote before the voting

41. **Mr. Toro Jiménez** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.48 contained wording which favoured the use of force and the rule of the strongest. The report of the Special Rapporteur was not credible as it was based on information obtained from biased and unreliable sources which had nothing to do with human rights. His delegation rejected the selective and confrontational approach taken by some States to human rights in country-specific resolutions. Human rights resolutions must, on the contrary, encourage dialogue and cooperation among States. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

42. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that the draft resolution did not encourage cooperation on human rights issues. Rather, it took a selective and politicized approach which infringed on the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity, discredited the Commission on Human Rights and undermined the work of the Committee. Cuba would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

43. **Mr. Westmoreland** (Malaysia) said that his delegation strongly opposed the draft resolution, which took a confrontational approach to human rights, as well as the culture of "naming and shaming". He urged members to reconsider drafting resolutions which targeted countries. Human rights issues must be based on the guiding principles of objectivity, transparency, territorial integrity, sovereignty and non-selectivity. Exploitation of human rights issues for political purposes was contrary to the Charter and must be excluded. Malaysia would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

44. **Ms. Adiwoso** (Indonesia) said that her delegation regretted the raising of country-specific issues. United Nations human rights mechanisms should devise new ways of addressing human rights more constructively through technical assistance and advisory services, including with respect to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Government of that country, for its part, should give attention to human rights issues, particularly relating to the abduction of foreigners. The draft resolution, however, was confrontational and counterproductive. She urged delegations to seek practical and feasible ways of protecting and promoting human rights in ways acceptable to the countries targeted. Her delegation would be voting against the draft resolution.

45. **Mr. La Yifan** (China) said that his delegation strongly regretted the submission of the draft resolution. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had made progress on improving North-South relations, promoting self-reliance and engaging in dialogue with the European Union. Those efforts should be encouraged. The practice of finger-pointing and "naming and shaming" should be ended. The politicized nature of the draft resolution served to increase confrontation. His delegation would therefore vote against it.

46. **Ms. Kornelliouk** (Belarus) said that her delegation continued to oppose country-specific resolutions, which were counter-productive. Human rights resolutions should be based on the principle of mutual respect. The draft resolution was divisive, and her delegation would vote against it.

47. **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan) said that his Government would continue to work with the international community for the protection and promotion of all human rights. The international community should encourage the efforts made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to improve the economic and social conditions of its people and protect human rights. His delegation rejected any resolution which targeted a specific country or involved human rights as a means to promote a political agenda. The draft resolution was characterized by politicization, selectivity and double standards. The Human Rights Council must address the issue of the targeting of largely developing countries in human rights resolutions. Moreover, many of the countries sponsoring such resolutions had themselves violated the economic, cultural and political rights of their citizens, which was further proof of their selectivity. The Sudan would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

48. **Mr. Aydogdyev** (Turkmenistan) said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, his country was guided by the principles of cooperation and non-selectivity and was against resolutions which targeted individual countries, especially as the records of the sponsors of such resolutions were far from perfect. The United Nations human rights machinery should avoid any politicization and seek to promote dialogue and

cooperation. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

49. **Mr. Kitchen** (Zimbabwe) said that his delegation was concerned at a human rights approach characterized by selectivity and double standards and regretted the submission of human rights draft resolutions for political purposes which did not advance the United Nations human rights agenda. Zimbabwe would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

50. **Ms. Khalil** (Egypt) said that her delegation had consistently and firmly voted against country-specific resolutions regardless of their objective or thematic aspects. Politicizing the issue of human rights served only to promote selectivity, double standards and confrontation. Such resolutions were not based on negotiations, dialogue and multilateral cooperation. Furthermore, they contradicted efforts to increase participation in United Nations human rights machinery, particularly through the establishment of a Human Rights Council, and infringed on respect for the religious, cultural and historical diversity of countries which was an essential part of human rights in all regions of the world and a pillar of dialogue among civilizations.

51. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Sudan, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia.

52. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.48 was adopted by 84 votes to 22, with 62 abstentions.**

53. **Mr. Shin** Kak-soo (Republic of Korea) said that his delegation shared the serious concern expressed in the draft resolution at the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. However, his Government had other crucial objectives which were vital to the promotion of peace and security in the region. Human rights issues were pursued within the overall framework of policies towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including through dialogue and providing assistance to improve the situation in the country.

54. His delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution. He expected that the

* The delegation of Estonia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution; and the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic that it had intended to vote against.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea would implement the international human rights instruments to which it was a party and work with the United Nations human rights machinery, including the special procedures.

55. **Mr. Ozawa** (Japan) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution as Japan was a victim of the abduction of its nationals by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. His delegation urged the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take the resolution seriously and to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur. The resolution was not intended as a means of naming and shaming but rather sought to encourage the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to work within the United Nations system.

Agenda item 39: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.61, L.64 and L.65)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.61: Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

56. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications and that Andorra, Benin and South Africa wished to become sponsors. He took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.61 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.64: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

58. **The Chairman** said that the following countries wished to sponsor the draft resolution: Andorra, Azerbaijan, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Poland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. He took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.64 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.65: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

60. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution, as orally revised, contained no programme-budget implications.

61. **Ms. Heikkilä** (Finland) introduced the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the sponsors as well as Andorra, the Bahamas, Belgium, Jamaica, Jordan, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovakia and Uruguay.

62. The draft resolution reaffirmed the General Assembly's support for the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and provided policy directives on essential aspects of that work, while recalling the shared responsibilities of States. The draft resolution clearly focused on new developments, particularly in the area of international protection and durable solutions, and reflected on the work undertaken by UNHCR and the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme over the previous year.

63. **The Chairman** announced that the following countries wished to sponsor the draft resolution, as orally revised: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, the Comoros, Guyana, Madagascar, Namibia, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Suriname and Zimbabwe.

64. **Mr. Elbadri** (Egypt) said that his delegation had sponsored the draft resolution, as in previous years, owing to its firm belief in the importance of the work of UNHCR. However, the current draft resolution should have placed more emphasis on the linkage between the legal responsibility of States to protect refugees and the principle of enhancing international solidarity and burden-sharing.

65. It should also have underlined the agreed principle of international support for and solidarity with those developing countries, least developed countries and countries with economies in transition that hosted refugees. The following year's resolution should follow those recommendations.

66. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country was committed to protecting refugees and displaced persons, had been actively engaged in the setting of national and international standards for refugees and displaced

persons, and had implemented specific measures to prevent their social exclusion.

67. Her delegation regretted that a consensus had not been achieved to avoid the deletion of the operative paragraph from the draft resolution urging all States to address the root causes of forced displacement. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had undertaken that commitment at several international forums, including the Organization of American States. Durable and effective solutions depended not only on the will and capacity of States, guided by a spirit of humanitarianism and international solidarity, but also on the essential support provided by UNHCR.

68. **The Chairman** took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally revised, without a vote.

69. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.65, as orally revised, was adopted.*

70. **Ms. Adjalova** (Azerbaijan) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted in order to reiterate its full support for the important work of UNHCR. However, it regretted that the text agreed by consensus in Geneva had been substantively changed, particularly owing to the deletion of the important operative paragraph on the root causes of forced displacement. Consequently, her delegation had withdrawn its sponsorship. All delegations should ensure their timely and active participation in the following year's consultations in Geneva. Furthermore, the agreement reached there should be preserved in New York in order to have a true consensus on the draft resolution to be adopted by the Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.